



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,254	09/24/2003	Yuji Okamoto	59880 (70904)	8151
21874 7590 07/05/2007 EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205			EXAMINER DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP	
			ART UNIT 2625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/05/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,254

Applicant(s)

OKAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Pawandeep S. Dhingra

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/24/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nobuhara et al., US 7,170,622 in view of Gassho et al., US 2002/0032703.

Re claim 1, Nobuhara et al. discloses an image processing device (see figure 3A), comprising: image data inputting means for inputting image data (see abstract); image data storing means for storing the image data inputted by the image data

inputting means (see abstract); image data processing means for processing the image data stored in the image data storing means (see column 5, line 53- column 6, line 11); and image data invalidating (i.e. erasing) means for performing invalidation of the image data (i.e. erasing of image data) stored in the image data storing means (see abstract, and figures 3-11; column 6, line 42 – column 7, line 22).

Nobuhara fails to explicitly disclose the image processing device further comprising: directing means for directing suspension of the invalidation performed by the image data invalidating means; and permitting means for permitting the suspension of the invalidation directed by the directing means.

However, Gassho et al. discloses the image processing device (i.e. printing system, see figure 1) comprising: directing means for directing suspension (i.e. holding) of the invalidation (i.e. deletion) performed by the image data invalidating (i.e. deleting) means (see figure 5, 11; paragraphs 81-83, and paragraphs 115-116, note that “whether printing job data is held in the hard disk 32 after printing or not can be set not for each of printing jobs but comprehensively, not only from the printer 30 but also from the client 20. Consequently, more convenience can be given to the user”, this way user can select whether he/she wants to suspend the deletion of data by deleting means at the print station after printing has been performed); and permitting means for permitting the suspension (i.e. holding) of the invalidation (i.e. deletion) directed by the directing means (see paragraphs 81-82).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image processing apparatus as disclosed by Nobuhara to include the method of high secret printing as taught by Gassho for the benefit of heightening the secrecy of the printing job as taught by Gassho in paragraph 124.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nobuhara et al., US 7,170,622 in view of Gassho et al., US 2002/0032703 further in view of Inoue Rieko et al. (also referred as Tokukaihei in this document), JP 09-284572.

Re claim 2, Both Nobuhara and Gassho fails to explicitly disclose the image data invalidating means continues the invalidation until the suspension of the invalidation is permitted.

However, Tokukaihei discloses the image data invalidating (i.e. deleting) means continues the invalidation (i.e. deletion) until the suspension (i.e. stopping) of the invalidation (i.e. deletion) is permitted (see paragraph 55, note that the deletion will be stopped once the request for stopping the deletion is made, hence the request is being permitted).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image processing apparatus as disclosed by Nobuhara to include the include the method of high secret printing as taught by Gassho, and image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei for the benefit of heightening the secrecy of the printing job as taught by Gassho in paragraph 124, and attaining

satisfactory security for the image data stored in the memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract.

4. Claim 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nobuhara et al., US 7,170,622 in view of Gassho et al., US 2002/0032703 further in view of Inoue Rieko et al. (also referred as Tokukaihei in this document), JP 09-284572 further in view of Shibata, US 2001/0000360.

Re claim 3, Nobuhara fails to disclose the permitting means permits the suspension of the invalidation after obtaining approval by an administrator who administrates the image processing device.

However, Gassho discloses the permitting means permits the suspension of the invalidation (see paragraph 81-83).

Shibata discloses permitting means permits the printing of data after obtaining approval (i.e. correct password) by an administrator (i.e. user) who administrates the image-processing device (see abstract, paragraphs 66-78, and 85-93).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image processing apparatus as disclosed by Nobuhara to include the method of high secret printing as taught by Gassho, image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei, and improved job security function as taught by Shibata for the benefit of heightening the secrecy of the printing job as taught by Gassho in paragraph 124, attaining satisfactory security for the image data stored in the

memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract, and having a system which "allows to cancel or output the accumulated print jobs when a prescribed password different from passwords for the job security function is entered via an operation unit" as taught by Shibata in abstract.

Re claim 4, Nobuhara fails to disclose the permitting means permits the suspension of the invalidation by input of a key operator code.

However, Gassho discloses the permitting means permits the suspension of the invalidation (see paragraph 81-83).

Shibata discloses the permitting means permits the printing of data by input of a key operator code (i.e. correct password) (see abstract, paragraphs 66-78, and 85-93).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image processing apparatus as disclosed by Nobuhara to include the method of high secret printing as taught by Gassho, image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei, and improved job security function as taught by Shibata for the benefit of heightening the secrecy of the printing job as taught by Gassho in paragraph 124, attaining satisfactory security for the image data stored in the memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract, and having a system which "allows to cancel or output the accumulated print jobs when a prescribed password different from passwords for the job security function is entered via an operation unit" as taught by Shibata in abstract.

5. Claim 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Nobuhara et al., US 7,170,622 in view of Inoue Rieko et al. (also referred as

Tokukaihei in this document), JP 09-284572 further in view of Shibata, US 2001/0000360.

Re claim 5, Nobuhara et al. discloses an image processing method, comprising the steps of: (a) storing image data and carrying out required image processing with respect to the image data thus stored (see abstract, and column 5, line 53- column 6, line 11); and (b) performing invalidation of the image data thus processed so as to prevent reproduction of the image data (see abstract, and figures 3-11; column 1, lines 13-50; column 6, line 42 – column 7, line 22);

Nobuhara fails to disclose (c) when request of suspension of the invalidation is made after the step (b) is started, carrying out identification of a user who made the request of the invalidation; and (d) suspending the invalidation after confirming that the user who made the request of the invalidation is a certified user.

However, Tokukaihei discloses request of suspension of the invalidation is made after the step (b) is started (see paragraph 55).

Shibata discloses carrying out identification of a user who made the request of printing (see abstract, paragraphs 66-78, and 85-93), and (d) suspending (i.e. canceling) the printing after confirming that the user who made the request of the printing is not a certified user (see abstract, paragraphs 66-78, and 85-93).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image processing apparatus as disclosed by Nobuhara to include the image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei, and improved job

security function as taught by Shibata in order to obtain the claimed invention by substituting the commands for printing as taught by Shibata with invalidation commands as taught by Nobuhara & Tokukaihei for the benefit of attaining satisfactory security for the image data stored in the memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract, and having a system which "allows to cancel or output the accumulated print jobs when a prescribed password different from passwords for the job security function is entered via an operation unit" as taught by Shibata in abstract.

Re claim 6, Nobuhara fails to disclose in the step (c), the identification of the user who made the request of the invalidation is carried out by input of a key operator code.

However, Shibata discloses the identification of the user who made the request of the printing is carried out by input of a key operator code (i.e. password) (see abstract, paragraphs 66-78, and 85-93).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image processing apparatus as disclosed by Nobuhara to include the image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei, and improved job security function as taught by Shibata in order to obtain the claimed invention by substituting the commands for printing as taught by Shibata with invalidation commands as taught by Nobuhara & Tokukaihei for the benefit of attaining satisfactory security for the image data stored in the memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract, and having a system which "allows to cancel or output the accumulated print jobs when a prescribed

password different from passwords for the job security function is entered via an operation unit” as taught by Shibata in abstract.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Morikawa, US 7019852, see whole document.

Akiba et al., US 6559967, see whole document.

Chrisop et al., US 2001/0025343, see whole document.

Koakutsu et al., US 6285459, see whole document.

Dan et al., US 7,230,731, see document for password validation.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pawandeep S. Dhingra whose telephone number is 571-270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Lamb can be reached on 571-272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2625

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pd

Pd
June 22, 2007


TWYLER LAMB
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER